S.N. 09/755,891 . . . . .Page 9

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-27 are rejected

The office action dated June 18, 2003 indicates that claims 1 and 13 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Dolby et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,630,025; and claims 20 and 27 are rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Dolby et al. in view of Montoyama et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,578,090. These rejections have been rendered moot by the amendments above to claims 1, 13, 20 and 27.

Amended claim 1 recites a method of configuring a disk array. The method comprises using a high-level language description to configure the disk array. For example, the high level language might describe RAID levels, cache page sizes, and stripe sizes for different disk array controllers.

Dolby et al. disclose an artificial intelligence system for selecting components of a computer. Dolby et al. do not disclose a disk array, nor do they teach or suggest how their system can be used to configure a disk array.

Montoyama et al. do not teach a disk array, nor do they teach or suggest how Dolby et al.'s system can be used to configure a disk array.[1] Therefore amended claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-12 should be allowable over Dolby et al. and Montoyama et al.

Amended claim13 recites a method for configuring a data storage device. The method comprises accessing a high-level language description that specifies

---

[1] The office action takes official notice of disk arrays. However, the office action does not provide evidence of reason, motivation, or incentive to apply the teachings of Dolby et al. to a disk array.

S.N. 09/755,891 . . . . .Page 10

how the data storage device stores data; and translating the high-level language description into device/host-independent commands.

Neither Dolby et al. nor Montoyama et al. teach or suggest accessing a high-level language description that specifies how a data storage device stores data. Therefore, amended claim 13 and its dependent claims 14-19 should be allowable over Dolby et al. and Montoyama et al.

Neither Dolby et al. nor Montoyama et al. teach or suggest configuring a disk array. For this additional reason, claim 19 should be allowable over Dolby et al. and Montoyama et al.

Amended claim 20 recites apparatus for configuring a data storage system. The apparatus comprises a processor for processing a high-level language description of the data storage system into configuration commands that can be used to set data storage parameters in the data storage system.

Neither Dolby et al. nor Montoyama et al teach or suggest processing a high-level language description into configuration commands that can be used to set data storage parameters in a data storage system. Therefore, amended claim 20 and its dependent claims 21-26 should be allowable over Dolby et al. and Montoyama et al.

Amended claim 27 recites an article for instructing a processor to configure a data storage system. The article comprises memory; and data encoded in the computer memory. When executed, the data instructs the processor to translate a high-level language description of the data storage system into specific commands that can be used to set configuration parameters of the data storage device.

S.N. 09/755,891 . . . . .Page 11

Neither Dolby et al. nor Montoyama et al teach or suggest translating a high-level description into specific commands that can be used to set configuration parameters in a data storage device. Therefore, amended claim 27 should be allowable over Dolby et al. and Montoyama et al.

Claims 19 and 25 have been amended to depend properly from their dependent claims. Claims 28-48 have been added to the application. Claims 28-32 depend from claim 1, claims 33-36 depend from claim 13, claims 37-40 depend from claim 20, and claims 41-48 depend from claim 27.

The application should now be in condition for allowance. The examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to discuss any remaining issues.